

**Table C-112a. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by State:
fiscal years 1993-2001**

[Dollars in millions]

Page 1 of 2

State	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Total	3,054.5	2,196.2	2,210.8	1,736.6	1,891.1	1,809.8	2,042.3	4,489.3	4,026.0
Alabama	368.2	94.1	44.1	48.9	43.4	38.6	66.6	210.6	202.6
Alaska	1.0	88.0	1.4	.2	3.0	.0	.0	.3	.4
Arizona	16.9	20.8	42.7	3.0	1.9	7.5	1.1	4.1	2.7
Arkansas	3.3	3.9	3.9	12.5	14.1	18.5	3.0	3.2	4.7
California	469.6	209.5	414.0	341.2	418.9	426.4	467.7	503.0	570.3
Colorado	30.0	36.9	31.2	28.4	52.6	63.3	43.2	34.6	54.5
Connecticut	14.4	3.8	5.2	3.6	5.2	2.6	2.3	91.0	55.6
Delaware	2.1	1.1	1.9	2.0	2.4	.8	1.1	.3	.1
District of Columbia	13.3	11.2	3.0	4.6	7.0	13.2	53.7	30.0	26.5
Florida	73.5	101.7	40.6	65.3	66.1	66.4	56.2	238.3	180.0
Georgia	3.5	5.3	12.4	4.6	5.2	3.8	8.5	9.2	20.1
Hawaii	19.3	14.3	.5	1.7	3.0	1.5	9.3	1.8	2.8
Idaho	27.4	12.5	8.9	19.2	26.2	11.5	8.2	27.2	18.4
Illinois	201.6	208.5	190.0	147.3	134.3	152.6	151.5	143.1	167.2
Indiana	22.6	4.1	4.8	15.2	7.9	3.1	6.7	12.2	18.0
Iowa	7.9	10.1	15.5	10.1	8.9	7.2	6.2	8.1	16.6
Kansas	10.1	10.6	1.2	1.5	1.4	.6	4.0	3.0	3.0
Kentucky0	3.9	4.7	2.4	.4	.0	.1	2.6	.8
Louisiana	29.5	21.0	21.5	26.5	18.6	30.4	28.8	11.7	16.5
Maine	1.0	1.9	.7	.2	.3	1.6	1.5	1.5	7.5
Maryland	264.6	196.2	390.3	240.2	299.6	304.2	302.2	352.4	107.5
Massachusetts	22.3	15.8	23.1	14.1	12.1	10.7	20.3	41.6	58.9
Michigan	21.7	4.5	3.7	6.3	5.0	3.0	5.9	5.9	17.6
Minnesota	3.0	17.2	5.1	6.3	2.6	3.5	7.2	3.7	7.5
Mississippi	42.2	31.9	36.5	32.8	38.8	47.6	26.8	20.7	31.0
Missouri	1.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	5.7	4.0	1.8	3.1	11.4
Montana	1.6	3.6	4.9	5.8	9.6	2.0	1.4	2.4	7.5
Nebraska	1.0	1.0	2.3	1.0	.8	.9	.9	3.4	12.2
Nevada	50.2	26.9	38.5	16.1	1.0	2.9	14.7	6.2	14.6
New Hampshire8	.3	.0	.6	2.3	.3	.5	4.1	2.6
New Jersey	53.2	45.3	34.9	26.7	29.9	32.1	30.8	46.4	39.2
New Mexico	181.4	152.6	133.8	77.5	124.8	113.9	99.8	122.2	159.7
New York	177.7	186.1	159.1	164.6	152.2	122.1	89.0	113.6	138.2
North Carolina	36.6	40.0	25.7	20.5	27.4	30.4	38.0	7.7	14.3
North Dakota	5.5	5.8	4.9	1.5	3.7	3.2	2.3	1.1	1.5
Ohio	64.1	128.1	147.5	67.5	49.7	91.2	108.1	68.7	84.4
Oklahoma	1.0	1.9	2.8	3.2	6.7	2.6	7.8	3.5	2.7
Oregon	13.8	6.5	5.2	8.1	5.9	3.2	8.9	4.0	16.2
Pennsylvania	95.7	72.2	35.4	51.3	40.8	17.9	28.0	63.3	39.9
Rhode Island6	.6	7.3	3.9	4.6	9.7	15.4	2.9	1.3
South Carolina	4.9	14.7	2.7	2.2	10.3	1.0	18.5	18.2	6.3
South Dakota	1.0	5.6	4.3	3.0	.4	.6	.2	2.2	.4
Tennessee	29.5	77.4	37.1	22.9	38.7	28.8	135.4	128.9	288.3
Texas	429.1	56.6	84.2	56.5	62.8	35.8	44.1	2,014.2	1,421.5
Utah	3.5	6.7	4.6	2.6	2.8	1.5	1.2	1.8	3.0
Vermont1	.6	.0	2.2	.5	.1	.5	2.1	.3
Virginia	131.0	126.6	81.1	69.7	56.6	53.7	61.3	60.6	114.4
Washington	71.6	71.5	64.3	71.8	64.8	12.1	14.9	12.1	20.5
West Virginia	8.4	4.8	5.4	2.6	2.8	12.6	25.0	18.4	18.6
Wisconsin	8.0	24.6	9.6	3.0	2.0	1.1	3.2	10.5	11.5
Wyoming6	1.8	1.5	.5	.6	.7	.3	.9	.3

See explanatory information, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

**Table C-112a. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by State:
fiscal years 1993-2001**

[Dollars in millions]

Page 2 of 2

State	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Outlying areas	13.1	0.5	1.4	8.3	4.3	3.1	7.5	5.6	3.7
Puerto Rico	NA	.4	.3	.3	.4	2.2	1.3	3.2	1.5
Other areas	NA	-	1.1	8.1	3.9	.9	6.2	2.4	2.2
Offices abroad6	.7	1.3	.5	.3	3.9	.5	.7	.6

KEY: - = Amount less than 50 thousand dollars
NA = Not applicable (indicates that the data collected for this table were not recorded at that level in that particular fiscal year)

NOTES: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

For each year, the data shown include the obligations of the 10 major R&D-supporting agencies that were required to report to this section of the survey in that year, and represent 96 percent or more of the total Federal R&D obligations in that year.

Although the nongeographic historical tables incorporate corrections to previously reported data that have been submitted by the reporting agencies, corresponding corrections to the geographic distributions are rarely obtainable.

Geographic distribution of Department of Defense development funding to industry reflects only the location of prime contractors, not the numerous subcontractors who perform much of the research and development.

Beginning in fiscal year 2000, the National Aeronautics & Space Administration reclassified Space Station as a physical asset and Space Station Research as equipment, and transferred funding for the program from R&D to R&D plant.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development: Fiscal Years 2001, 2002, and 2003